

Remarks

Claims 1-12 are currently pending in the patent application. For the reasons and arguments set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited references.

The instant Office Action dated December 14, 2007 lists the following rejections: claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over He *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,323,849) in view of Duwaer *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,922,240); and claims 4 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over He in view of Duwaer as applied to claim 1, and in further view of Sarrasin *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,600,343). Applicant traverses these rejections.

The instant Office Action acknowledges that the He reference does not teach a display circuit arrangement that includes a row drive circuit having a logic function connected in front of the row outputs. Instead, the Duwaer reference is relied upon for allegedly disclosing logic connected in front of row outputs in a display driver. It is argued in the Office Action that one of skill in the art would seek to modify the display module disclosed by the He reference by incorporating logic connected in front of row outputs as disclosed by Duwaer. Applicant submits that the proposed combination would not result in Applicant's claimed invention, and moreover that there is no valid reason to make the proposed combination.

Duwaer discloses an active matrix display addressing scheme where each of the pixels is controlled by separate transistors, the transistors being controlled by row and column driver lines. The logic circuitry shown in Duwaer's Figure 9 controls how the rows are scanned, for example in a progressive or interlaced manner (*see, e.g.*, Col. 8:41-55). Applicant finds nothing in Duwaer to teach or suggest the claimed aspects of operating the disclosed display device in a partial mode (*e.g.*, where an unneeded portion of the display is deactivated to save power), or of supplying a control signal to the logic function to activate and deactivate row outputs based on the partial mode. As such, incorporating Duwaer's row driver logic circuitry into the display circuit of He would not provide the partial mode control as recited in Applicant's claims. Applicant therefore submits that the proposed combination does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Applicant further submits that one of skill in the art would find no reason to modify the teachings of He in the proposed manner. He already provides a control circuit that controls both the row and the column drivers, and that can be used to turn off unused portions of the display when in a partial display mode (*see, e.g.*, Col. 3:13-15). One of skill in the art would not seek to add additional logic circuitry to the device of He when the functionality allegedly sought to be added is already present. Such redundancy contradicts the reasons proffered by the Office Action for making the combination, namely to produce a system with a more compact size. One of skill in the art would also not seek to modify He by replacing the control circuit with logic circuitry connected in front of the row outputs because the control circuit of He is meant to control both the row drivers and the column drivers. Applicant therefore submits that a valid reason to modify the He reference in the suggested manner has not been presented.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-12 is improper, and requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The § 103(a) rejection of claims 4 and 8 is predicated on the underlying combination of He and Duwaer as applied to claim 1. The Sarrasin reference is introduced for its alleged disclosure and use of shift registers. Applicant submits that Sarrasin appears to provide no teaching or disclosure that could be used to cure the deficiencies of the underlying combination as discussed above. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that the § 103(a) rejection of claims 4 and 8 is improper, and requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicant additionally points out that new claims 13 and 14 have been added. These new claims depend from claim 4, and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, John Rehberg, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9063 (or the undersigned).

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131

CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By: 

Name: Robert J. Crawford

Reg. No.: 32,122

651-686-6633 x2300

(NXPS.294PA)